

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks.

Claims 10-14, 30, and 36-39 Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Lin in view of Ohta

With respect to independent claims 10, 30, 36, and 37:

The Office at 3. states that Lin discloses a linear stage for producing linear movement. Applicant disagrees and cites Lin at Fig. 2, Fig. 3, Fig. 4 at 10, 12, and 20, the Summary of the Invention, and col 2, lines 40-61, as disclosing a rotating stage for producing motion, not as Applicant has claimed a linear stage. Lin in view of Ohta does not disclose or suggest what Applicant has claimed because the rotary motion of Lin in view of the swinging motion of Ohta would produce a cycloid-type motion.

Lin in view of Ohta fails to disclose or make obvious what Applicant has claimed. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection for claims 10-14, 30, and 36-39.

Further with respect to dependent claims 11-14, and 38-39:

These claims inherit the limitations of the independent claims on which they depend, and as noted above Lin in view of Ohta fails to disclose or make obvious what Applicant has claimed because Lin in view of Ohta produces a cycloid-type motion not linear motion. Additionally, Lin in view of Ohta fails to disclose or make obvious the additional limitations of wherein said linear movement stage is capable of movement in one or more directions; wherein said linear movement stage is capable of movement back and forth; wherein said controller is coupled to control illumination of zero or more LEDs of said array of LEDs;

wherein said controller is coupled to control positioning of said linear movement stage;
wherein said moving further comprises moving at substantially a non-constant velocity; and
wherein said energizing further comprises energizing at substantially a non-constant time
interval of claims 11-14, and 38-39 respectively. Applicant respectfully requests removal of
the rejection for these claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the rejection of dependent claims not specifically addressed, are addressed by Applicant's arguments to the claim(s) on which they depend.

Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance and requests such.

Communication via cleartext email is authorized.

Respectfully submitted,

Heimlich Law

02/23/2009 /ip/48808Alan Heimlich

Date Alan Heimlich / Reg 48808

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Customer No. 40418

5952 Dial Way
San Jose, CA 95129

Tel: 408 253-3860
Em: alanheimlich@heimlichlaw.com